

**REMARKS**

Entry of this Amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all the pending claims are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants have amended several of the claims to improve form and clarify the claimed subject matter.

Claims 1-24, as shown above, remain pending herein.

(1) Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over S. Takao et al. (Segmentation and Classification of TV news articles based on speech dictation, Department of Electronics and Informatics, Ryukoku University, September 15, 1999 IEEE, hereinafter “Takao”) in view of Park et al. (U.S. 6,597,738 hereinafter “Park”). Applicants respectfully traverse for the reasons indicated herein below.

The instant application refers to the problem in that previously it was not known to classify a segment by keyword into one or more classifications. Instead, generic terminology was often used that would/could might not be picked upon a search.

Accordingly, Applicants have amended base claim 1 to recite, *inter alia* that the classifier classifies one or more classifications of said video signals that have been segmented into said at least one story segment. Similar amendments were made to base claims 7, 13 and 19. Support is found in the specification at least at page 24, lines 3-7, and lines 13-17.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Takao and Park fails to disclose or suggest one or more classifications for a particular video segment. The combination, as alleged in the Office Action, purportedly classifies video key frames with

one or more segments, but the combination is silent regarding more than one classification (as for multiple stories).

For at least the above reason, none of the instant claims would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art over the combination of references.

Furthermore, with regard to rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the MPEP cites the case of 973, F.2d 1260, 1266, 23 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1780, 1783-84 (Fed. Cir. 1992), where the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that:

Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination. Under section 103, teachings of references can be combined *only* if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so. Although couched in terms of combining teachings found in the prior art, the same inquiry must be carried out in the context of a purported obvious “modification” of the prior art. The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification.

Similar to *Fritch*, the combination of references fails to make the suggestion or the desirability of the modification such that a person of ordinary skill would have found any of the instant claims to be obvious at the time of invention.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Tony Piotrowski  
Registration No. 42,080



Date: September 22, 2003

By:

Steve Cha  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,069



**Mail all correspondence to:**

Tony Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,080  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9624  
Fax: (914) 332-0615

**Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP AF, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22313 on September 22, 2003.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069  
(Name of Registered Rep.)

  
9/22/03  
(Signature and Date)